

REMARKS

Claims 1-9 and 11-22 are now pending in the application. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102 and 103

Claims 1-4 and 6-8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Great Britain Patent No. GB 2275871. Claims 9, 11, 14-16 and 22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Enk. Claim 5 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Great Britain Patent No. 2275871. Claims 12 and 13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being patentable over Enk.

At the outset, Applicant notes independent claim 1 includes "a system for providing a signal to an individual to indicate that said fire extinguishing medium from said reservoir is being communicated through said supply line to said nozzle." Applicant respectfully asserts this feature as claimed is neither taught nor suggested by GB 2275871.

GB 2275871 does not disclose whatsoever a system for providing a signal to an individual that a fire extinguishing medium is being transferred through a reservoir to a supply line to a nozzle as claimed. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully asserts independent claim 1 is patentable and in condition for allowance. Further, as claims 2-4 and 6-8 depend from independent claim 1, these claims are also believed to be patentable over GB 2275871.

Amendment in claim 9 recites "a method for suppressing a fire . . . communicating fluid from said fluid supply through at least one fluidic communication

line . . . signaling a user that said fluid is being communicated through said at least one fluid communication line.” None of the references cited by the Examiner, including GB 2275871 or Enk et al. disclose or fairly suggest signaling a user that a fluid is being communicated through a fluidic communication line. Therefore, the art of record does not anticipate each of the elements of presently pending claim 9 and the Applicant requests that the Examiner withdraw each of the rejections regarding the presently pending independent claim 9. Further, the Applicant submits that each of the claims depending directly or indirectly from independent claim 9 are also in condition for allowance.

With regard to claims 5, 12 and 13, Applicant notes claim 5 depends from independent claim 1. As stated previously, Applicant believes independent claim 1 is patentable and in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicant believes claim 5 is also patentable and in condition for allowance. Claims 12 and 13 depend from claim 9, which should also be allowed, and thus each claim depending from claim 9 is also in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections are respectfully requested.

ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER

The Examiner states that Claims 17-21 are allowed. Applicant thanks the Examiner for this preliminary indication of allowable subject matter.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: July 20, 2004

By: 
Michael L. Taylor, Reg. No. 50,521

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

MLT/EKS/ps